The Impact of Affective and Cognitive Aspects of Translators' Attitudes to Text Translation

Asst. prof. Anis Behnam Naoum* & Asst. lecturer.Yahya Khalid Abid**

تاريخ التقديم: 2010/5/2 تاريخ القبول: 2010/5/26

1. Introduction:

Speaker's/ writer's attitude plays an essential role in assigning meaning to any stretch of language. An attitudinal meaning expresses the degree of commitment of the speaker to the truth of what is being said (cf. Palmer, 1981: 153). Attitude, however, is not a unanimously agreed upon term. Some scholars restrict it to evaluative judgements constructed on the spot (Schwarz, 2006:19), hence denying its existence. Traditionalists, however, look at it as a hypothetical construct that psychologists invented to explain phenomena of interest (Schwarz, 2007:1). It is activated by retrieval and expressed with some degree of favour or disfavour. Constructionalists, however, deny the existence of these hypothetical constructs. For them, attitudes are tendencies to form judgement about a certain attitude object. From this perspective, attitudes are highly context-sensitive. Metacognitivists, on the other hand, emphasize the role of retrieval and construction in forming attitudes (cf. Petty et al, 2007:3). According to them, people can retrieve evaluations associated with attitude object and modify them as befits the relevant situation.

The four functional areas of attitudes as proposed by Katz (cited in Jones,2006:23-25) are:

1. adjustment or adaptive function: this category embraces those attitudes which are utilitarian in function. These attitudes are affective associations based upon previous experiences. They are dependent on reward and punishment principle.

* Dept. of Translation / College of Arts/ University of Mosul.
** Dept. of Translation/ College of Arts/ University of Mosul.

2. ego defensive function: in this case attitudes stem from within the person. Katz gives the example of an individual who projects hostility to a minority in order to protect himself from feelings of inferiority. One common type of ego defensive function is transference where an attitude adopted towards a person is not based on the reality of the situation. These ego defensive attitudes stem basically from internal conflicts.
3. the value expressive function: it gives positive expression to central values and to the type of person an individual conceives himself to be. Favourable attitudes towards a group very often have a value expressive function.
4. knowledge function: this function refers to our need for a world which is consistent and relatively stable. It helps us organize and structure our experiences.

The existence of positive and negative evaluations on the scale of attitude object evaluation may result, however, in contrast effect. The size of that contrast effect is again a function of the evaluative consistency of the information used in forming that standard.

Volosinov's (1973, cited in Sarangi 2003:165; Page, 2003: 212) states that no utterances can be put together without value judgement. "The idea that speaker always adopts a position in relation to the addressee and a stance in relation to what is said is a long standing and fundamental one modeled in terms of an interpersonal linguistic resource that is always in play when the parallel ideational one construes meaning." This aspect of the theoretical model has been further illuminated by Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) whereby content is construed as information for exchange (Painter, 2003:183).

This study is concerned with utterances that can be interpreted and/or assessed as inviting the readers/translators to supply their own negative or positive assessments. Therefore, it is hypothesized that translators, just like the writers of the ST, take position whether positive or negative

towards the material to be translated, revealing their feelings towards such events and providing their evaluation of the people and circumstances involved (Pounds, 2005: 50). Moreover, since attitudes are better seen not as a property of individual words but of complete utterances that present a complete proposition, it is hypothesized that uncovering attitudes depends on the reader/ translator bringing particular sets of beliefs and expectations to the process of interpreting these utterances(White, 2005:2). Finally, it is hypothesized that language evaluation cannot be seen as only a text-based or context-bound phenomenon but as a psychologically and socioculturally based one. Consequently, the same event may receive different judgements according to the interpreter's ideological position (cf. Eggins and Slade, 1997, cited in Page, 2003:213).

2. Martin's Appraisal Model(2000)

Martin's Appraisal analysis (2000, cited in Martin, 2003) focusing on the system of attitude concerned with the linguistic expression of negative and positive evaluation, is likely to be sensitive to the potential for different readings of attitudinal meanings, and hence the process of constructing appraisal. Drawing on (SFL) background, Martin (2000, cited in Martin, 2003) proposes subdividing attitudinal meaning into three fundamental subcategories: affect, judgement and appreciation (cf. Szalay and Deese, 1978:21; Page, 2003: 213; Folkeryd, 2006). These subcategories or components of attitude structure are controlled and directed by cognitions, represented in one's beliefs, expectations and perception relative to the focal object (cf. Scholl, 2000:1).

2.1 Affect

Affective meaning is usually defined as a reflection of the speaker's/ writer's personal attitudes or feelings towards the listener or the target of the utterance (Mwihaki, 2004: 134). Similarly, Yunfei (1999:151) points out that "each individual has his own sphere of experience, and his connotations (i.e. "the emotional associations" which a word or a phrase

suggests in one's mind) of words may well be based on personal experience with the referents." In other words, all words can potentially convey affective meaning even those more apparently neutral due to their semantic relation with emotional concepts (Strapparava et al, 1971:164).

To Lyons (1981: 143-4), the expressive function relates to everything which falls within the scope of 'self-expression' that can be subdivided into emotive (or affective) meaning to make the speaker/ writer reveals his personality which is the product of his socialization, and which may have, as Lobner (2002: 34-35) states, social consequences such as swearing words. Hence, affect (emotion) signifies evaluation of the emotional status of the writer/ speaker indicating how they are emotionally disposed to the person, thing, happening, or state of affairs as revealed in the linguistic form of expression. Affectual positioning may be indicated through verbs of emotion, adverbs and adjectives of emotions, etc. e.g, I am worried about the situation, I feel relieved (Folkeryd, 2006: 60).

Such emotional assessment resides entirely in the individual subjectivity of the language user who tries to establish an interpersonal bond with the reader to the extent that the reader agrees with, understands or at least sympathizes with that emotional reaction. In other words, emotiveness is associated with subjectivity and intended to have certain emotive responses from those to whom the emotive-charged expressions are directed (or just to satisfy certain personal psychological needs).

Building on these facts on affect, the translator foregrounds through affect his subjective presence in communication and seeks to establish an interpersonal bond with the reader to the extent that makes the reader agree with, understand or at least sympathesize with his emotional relation (Page,2003: 225). Folkeryd (2006: 69) subdivides affect into four major sets/ criteria: un/happiness (e.g misery/ joy), in/security (e.g fear vs. calmness), dis/satisfaction (e.g discomfort/ comfort), and dis/inclination (e.g longing/ desire).

2.2 Judgement

Judgement (ethics) is the second realization of attitude. It refers to the attitudinal evaluation in which human behaviour is negatively or positively assessed by reference to some set of social and cultural norms and legality as well as some individualistic factors (Folkeryd, 2006: 69). Judgemental positioning may be indicated through adverbials, attributes and epithets, nominals, and verbs. It can also be indicated through modality conceptualized by Palmer (1981: 34) as "the judgements one makes about possible or impossible states of affairs" as in John may be in his office. Moreover, the pragmatic aspect of modality is highlighted by Verschueren (1999:129) who states that it "involves the ways in which attributes can be expressed towards the pure reference and prediction of an utterance, signaling factuality, degrees of certainty or doubt, vagueness, possibility, necessity, permission and obligation." Moreover, Judgements can either be expressed explicitly (inscribed judgement) by evaluative lexical items such as skillfully, corruptly, etc. or implicitly (token). Accusing the government of incompetence, for example, entails negative evaluation of its behaviour (White, 2005:4).

The most obvious examples of judgement involve assessment by reference to systems of legality/ illegality, morality/ immorality, or politeness/ impoliteness. In other words, judgement is more or less codified in the culture of the language user as well as his individual experiences, expectations ,assumptions and beliefs. The social norms of morality and legality entail a number of variables: capacity (mental capacity and physical strength, e.g clever, stupid, strong); normality (luck and originality as in 'lucky,' 'predictable,' 'odd'); tenacity and veracity (reliability e.g reliable, unreliable); and propriety (kindness, morality e.g kind, malicious) (Folkeryd 2006:70).

2.3 Appreciation

Appreciation (aesthetics) refers to the assessments of the form, appearance, composition, impact, significance etc. of human artifacts, natural objects as well as human individuals, but not of human behaviour (Martin,2003:173). Appreciation entails three subcategories: recreation, composition, and valuation. Recreation evaluates objects or processes in terms of their quality or impact on the receptor (e.g wonderful book, dramatic events). Composition evaluates the process or product according to the way of its make (e.g harmonious tunes, well-documented research). Finally valuation or the social value assesses the object or product according to the various social conventions (e.g significant, unique, provocative, etc.) (Folkeryd, 2006: 75).

3. Analysis of Attitude

In the analysis of appraisal attitudes, attitude subtypes are not clear-cut, two-valued categories; they show also further degrees of delicacy (Page, 2003:214). Within affect, for example, we have happiness/ unhappiness, security/ insecurity, etc. and there are degrees of delicacy between happiness and unhappiness. For each of these subdivisions, the appraisal may be expressed on positive or negative polarity, relative to the cultural values of the speaker and listener. Any instance of appraisal can also be expressed with more or less intensity. Moreover strategies for either intensifying the appraisal (enrichment or augmenting) or playing down an opinion (mitigation) coexist with choices from the categories of affect, judgement and appreciation. For example, the judgement 'wrong' can be augmented with the intensifier 'completely.' Moreover, any instance of appraisal can be direct (inscribed) or implied (evoked).The interpretation of evoked types of appraisal depends heavily on the inferences made by the audience of the text. It involves a degree of subjectivity and must be understood as situated within particular cultural

contexts. As such, these instances present occasions where there may be the possibility for multiple interpretations.

3.1Expressing Attitude in Language and Translation

Attitudes are not usually expressed linguistically in the text, but most frequently implied by the way the main thoughts are organized and represented in the text. Ramat (1993: 35, cited in Pounds, 2005: 55) states that linguistic use seems to reflect a strong expectation that complexity of linguistic expression (e.g very long sentences, frequent use of subordination and unusual lexical items) is an indication of the speaker or writer's quality of thought, intellectual ability and, ultimately, authority." Ramat (ibid: 63) adds that "when the claims are literally stated in the text it is possible to identify the key linguistic items (often modal verbs and adverbs) that can be seen to qualify the degree of commitment to the truth value [validity] or to the normative rightness of the claim" as in the following examples respectively:

(1) Our seas are undoubtedly polluted.
(2) New measures must be found to clean our seas.

To Pounds (2005: 52), attitudinal meaning is expressed through different functions, the most important of which is the argumentative (persuasive) function "in which the emphasis is on the expression of views and opinions rather than on narration or description". Pounds also states that writers may present new information on particular topics and express their emotive reaction to events and states of affairs. The writer's evaluation and the emotive attitude (i.e attitudinal meaning) to the events and people on which claims are made, he adds, is visible throughout th**e** argumentative function where "the writer's main claim may be directly stated in or inferable from or implied in the text" (ibid: 61).

Lefevere (cited in Tainmin, 1999: 7-8) looks at translation as "rewriting a text in terms of another with the intention of adapting that other text to a certain ideology (the translator's personal set of assumptions, values and attitudes

which govern the way he represents his experience) or to a certain poetics." Longer before Lefevere, Nida and Taber (1974:91) maintain that "we not only understand the reference of words; we also react to them emotionally… sometimes affirmatively, sometimes negatively." The emotive reaction towards words and their connotations "are relative to the speakers [writers/ translators] and their environment" (Tymoczko, 1978: 30). However, all linguistic and translational purposes, as Sager (1994:71) states, vary in the degree of personal involvement, i.e. "in the degree of affectivity displayed by the writer …and reflected in the choice of words and the mode of expression." Consequently, the effect of expected errors, whether randomly distributed in the text or well patterned, may tell about the translator's intent. In the latter case, however, they suggest an unconscious bias or even a conscious ideological predisposition on the part of the translator" (Sullivan, 1999:2).

3.2 Positivity and Negativity of Evaluation

The ideological semantics underlying lexical selection such as that between "freedom fighter" and "terrorist" follows a rather clear strategic pattern viz. positive or negative polarity. Mental representations of the ingroup (positive self presentation) and outgroup (negative other presentation) in terms of attitude schemata and underlying ideologies feature the overall evaluative concepts that influence lexical selection (Van Dijk, 1995:143; 2005:65). There are strong social and cultural constraints, however, that do not permit direct expression of attitudes especially negative ones (Van Dijk, 1981:132).

The following different discourse structures and strategies may be predicted to be ideologically relevant depending on topic, context, speech act and communicative goals for ingroups and outgroups(Van Dijk, 1995:144): emphasis vs. de-emphasis, assertion vs. denial, hyperbole vs. understatement, topicalization vs. de-topicalization, headlining, summarizing vs. marginalization, attribution to

personality vs. attribution to context, explicit vs. implicit, and direct vs. indirect.

These different discourse structures apply to different levels of text. Thus, emphasis for example applies to the phonological structures (e.g stress, intonation, etc.), syntactic structures (e.g word order, topicalization, etc.) semantic structures(e.g explicit vs. implicit, macrostructures vs. details) pragmatic structures (e.g assertion vs. denial self congratulation vs. accusation) rhetorical structures (e.g under and overstatement, repetition, euphemizing, etc.) (Van Dijk,1995: 145; 2006: 373).

The positivity and negativity of evaluation, motivated by the goal of positive self-presentation and negative other presentation, is clearly reflected in the language by means of using certain linguistic strategies: negative lexicalization, hyperbole, apparent honesty move, negative comparison, generalization, etc.(Van Dijk, 1989:123; 1995: 154-159).

4. Procedure and Data Analysis

To investigate the role of attitudes in translation, a text from (NYT, by Mark D.W. Edington, 2 March 1993, cited in Van Dijk, 1995:150-151), has been selected to be translated by five MA students (thought to be competent due to their achievement during the qualifying year courses (2006-2007) at the Translation Department, College of Arts, University of Mosul. Their renderings have been analyzed along Martin's Appraisal Model (2000, cited in Martin, 2003) which subdivides attitudinal meaning into affect, judgement, and appreciation. The paper emphasizes the role of attitudinal meaning generated through the argumentative/ persuasive function (Pounds 2005: 61) in the context of a journalistic political text. The investigation includes attitudinal meanings and intentionality conveyed in the text through both linguistic structures choices (modals, adverbs etc.), and context.

To test the validity of the translators performance, one of the renderings was given to two other competent MA students to evaluate the translator's performance with respect to the legitimacy of management in translation and the degree

of faithfulness required to the source text. The evaluations are modified, adapted and then stated in the appendix(2. a & b) for convenience without comments. The rationale behind this procedure, however, is to encourage research in the two domains outlined above, and to test the reliability of translation theory (or theories) from the student translators' perspective. Finally one of the test subjects' renderings (Translator 5, Appendix 2-c) has been left unanalyzed since it conforms, according to the researchers, with the norms and ethics of translation. It is characterized by faithfulness to the ST in form (structure and style) and content; hence it suits as a standard translation in terms of a general theory of translation. It may also be useful for readers to compare it with other renderings and draw their own conclusions.

5. S.T Analysis:

The ST reads:

> *In our radical interpretation of democracy, our rejection of elites, our well-nigh demagogic respect for the opinions of the unlearned, we are alone. (...)***(1)***. The demands of leadership, if not a sense of moral responsibility, will not permit us to abdicate our responsibility for protecting innocent civilians and standing up against state-sponsored slaughter***(2)***. But as we take on such roles, we will more often make enemies than friends, and some may have the means and, they think, the motives to hurt us at home***(3).*** Among the rewards for our attempts to provide the leadership needed in a fragmented, crisis-prone world will be as yet unimagined terrorists and other assorted sociopaths determined to settle scores with us***(4)***. We cannot afford to react by withdrawing from the world. Rather, we need to react prudently. (...)***(5)***. (NYT, Mark D.W. Edington, 2 March 1993, cited in Van Dijk, 1995: 150-151).*

The text is mainly directed to American readers; it expresses very extreme views about America's uniqueness in the world with regard to democracy, the competence to lead the world and protect the innocent. America according to the text, for all its good acts, however, is rewarded with terrorists and sociopaths obsessed with settling old scores with it. It is quite clear that any reader, apart from the American ones, will find it too extreme and strange. So, the translator of this text bears the heavy burden of adapting this text to the TL reader.

The SL writer adopted certain strategies for presenting his views; the most important of which is the strategy of **ingroup-outgroup polarization**. Typical of such polarization is ingroup favouring and outgroup derogation, positive self presentation and the association of **OUR** group with all good things and **THEIR** group with all bad things. This appears very clearly in the text in sentence (4) "our attempt to provide the leadership needed in a fragmented crisis-prone world" (that is the crisis is elsewhere and not in America), vs. "they are sociopaths determined to settle old scores with us." The writer even claims in sentence (1) that "we are alone in our radical interpretation of democracy," thereby also establishing a difference with the other democratic countries in the world. This means, according to the writer, that the US leadership will always be confronted with enemies. In sum, the writer wants to say: we in the US are associated with positive values (democracy, responsibility), positive activities (leadership) and positive goals (protecting the innocent), as prominent categories of the ideological schema organizing this and similar opinion articles (Van Dijk,1995:151) .

The writer relies heavily on the use of **deictic expressions** such as "our radical interpretation, our rejection, our…respect, we are alone"…etc to differentiate between **US** and **THEM**. He also makes use of the strategy of **bare assertion** (presenting personal opinions as if they were facts) (White, 2003: 264). This strategy presupposes that the speaker/ writer and audience operate with the same knowledge, beliefs and values. The textual voice constructs itself as being in solidarity with a readership.

6. TTs Analysis

6.1 Translator 1. rendering. (Appendix 1.a)

As the SL text is mainly written for the Americans, it expresses views which may seem unacceptable to Arab readers in that these views are too extreme. Hence, the translator did his best to alienate the text and at the same time adapt it to the TL reader. He managed somehow to fulfil this purpose by using certain translation strategies like managing, alienation, adaptation, addition…etc. He was also apparently able to a certain extent to steer the situation towards his own goals: not to commit himself to the views presented in the ST, and to express in an indirect way his disbelief in what is said.

Building on such understanding of the text, the translator adopted strategies like expansion; that is adding to the text lexical expressions that are not in the ST like "يرى مارك", "المزعومة", "على حد زعمه", "على حد تعبيره" and "حسبما يرى" as in sentences 1-5 respectively. He also introduced certain additions that do not exist in the ST as in تنفرد عن جميع شعوب العالم and زعامة العالم in sentences 1 and 2 respectively. The translator also, to detach himself from the situation, tried to alienate the text by attributing it to a third person (its SL writer مارك Sentence 1) and doing away with deictic expressions "our," "we" and "us" as in "our radical interpretation of democracy," "our rejection of…," "we are alone" (Sentence 1) which are rendered as: إن أمريكا تنفرد...في ترجمة الديمقراطية إلى واقع عملي و رفض حكم النخبة و إبداء التعاطف...الخ. (sentence 1) and in "the demand of leadership…will not permit us" translated as لذا فهي تجد لزاما عليها and "our responsibility" translated into مسؤوليتها المزعومة(sentence 2); and "as we take on such roles" rendered as غير أن التزام أمريكا بهذه المواقف (sentence 3). Moreover, in his attempt to deemphasize the impact of the ST claims, he tones down strong expressions as in sentences 1 and 2 "the opinion of the unlearned" and "state-sponsored slaughter" translated into آراء العامة and إرهاب الدول instead of معتقدات الجهلاء and والمجازر التي ترعاها الدولة, respectively.

The translator relied on using inverted commas to achieve this purpose as in "التزام أخلاقي," "تتناوشه الأزمات," "العالم الممزق" and " المهووسين بالعنف " as in (sentences 2 and 5). He also employed the strategy of bare assertion used by the SL writer in rendering the views presented by the SL text in a fact-like form into mere personal views as in " we are alone" translated as يرى مارك أن أمريكا تنفرد (sentence 1) and "the demand of leadership will not permit us to abdicate our responsibility" rendered as لذا فهي تجد لزاما عليها بدافع إحساسها بما يقع على عاتقها من "التزام أخلاقي" في زعامة العالم...الخ. (sentence 2).

6.2 Translator 2. Rendering (Appendix 1. b)

A general look at this rendering gives an idea that the translator's priority is to be faithful to the ST message, reinforcing the claimed attitudes and intentionality.

If one supposes that the ST includes extreme views (represented in the text by personal views, deictic expressions such as 'our' and 'we', etc.), one can similarly notice that the TT is more extreme than the ST itself. The translator, whether intentionally or not, charged the TT with further emotions. This is evident in his reliance on certain strategies such as topicalization, assertion, hyperbolization, negative lexicalization, explicitation, etc. as in rendering sentence 1 "in our radical interpretation of democracy" into نحن خير من يفسر مفهوم الديمقراطية بكل دقائقه وجزئياته; sentence 2 "state sponsored slaughter" into هول قطع للأعناق ترعاه الدولة; sentence 3 "take on such roles" into نضطلع بادوار مشرفة كهذه, and "making enemies" into نحيط أنفسنا بحلقة من العداوة والبغضاء; sentence 5 "react prudently" into سنكون الدواء الشافي لهذا الداء. The translator also made use of emphasis to highlight the claims of the ST writer with respect to the evil forces in the world vs. the good one as in rendering "unlearned" (in sentence 1) into الحثالة, and "we will more often make enemies than friends" and "we take on such roles" (sentence 3) rendered into فإننا لا محالة نحيط أنفسنا بحلقة من العداوة والبغضاء and ادوار مشرفة, respectively.

Faithfulness to the ST is also evidently represented by the translator's commitment to the negative lexicalization used in the ST as in "unlearned" (sentence 1), "fragmented, crisis-

prone", "unimagined terrorists" and "assorted sociopaths" (sentence 4) respectively translated into: عالم, احتقارنا لآراء الحثالة شذاذ and إرهاب يحرق الحرث والنسل, ممزق الأوصال نزاع إلى الأزمات الآفاق as well as adding المد البربري (sentence 5) (Lit. Barbarian tide) and إرهاب يحرق الحرث والنسل (sentence 4).

Taking into account that the TL readers operate with different attitudes and ideologies, misunderstanding or communication failure is expected in the above renderings. However, the questions that can be raised in this regard are: to what extent is the translator authorized to keep the polarization nature of the text intact? To what extent is the alignment of the ST towards the target audience possible? To what extent can neutrality be realized? These and probably other questions are in the mind of translators while translating political texts.

Moreover, if we suppose that the translator is aware of the deceptive nature of bare assertion in the ST (where personal views are presented as if they were facts), is he allowed to highlight it as translator 2 did in rendering sentence 1 "in our radical interpretation of democracy … we are alone" into نحن خير من ... آراء الحثالة and sentence 2 "the demand of leadership …state sponsored slaughter" into ان متطلبات القيادة ... ترعاه الدولة على نحو منهجي?

6.3 Translator 3 Rendering (Appendix 1. c)

Translator 3 does not have a clear attitude, whether positive or negative, towards the ST. He gives priority to the ST intentionality over the TT acceptability, including his readers' expectations. Hence, the subjective voice in the ST and the WE- THEM polarization strategy adopted by the ST (probably intended to derogate all non-Americans) remained intact as in the translation of "we are alone" (sentence 1) and "provide the leadership needed in a fragmented crisis-prone world" (sentence 4) into: نحن نتميز and لتامين القيادة الضرورة لعالم متفكك وهش في وجه الأزمات respectively. However, the translator's rendering of sentence 1 "in our radical…" into نحن نتميز عن غيرنا في منظورنا الجذري... attributes more positive features to American democracy than actually intended by the ST.

Moreover, his rendering of " our rejection elites" and "respect for the opinions of the unlearned" into رفضنا للنخبوية and احترامنا لغير المتعلمين still presupposes the contrary to the non-Americans.

Though he intentionally left "well-nigh demagogic" untranslated in order not to lose meaning and confuse his readers (as he stated in a note), the translation of "the demands of leadership", and "state sponsored slaughter" (sentence 2), and "unimagined terrorists" (sentence 3) into مركزنا القيادي, المذابح التي تقف وراءها سياسات بعض الدول and إرهابيين لم يكونوا بالحسبان, respectively also presupposes 'subordination', 'absence of moral responsibility' and 'prevalence of slaughter and terrorism in the outgroup.'

6.4 Translator 4 Rendering (Appendix 1. d)

Right from the outset, the translator starts his translation by foregrounding the text documentation at the end of ST: يرى الكاتب مارك ادنكتون في مقال نشر بصحيفة النيويورك تايمز بتاريخ 2 آذار 1993: trying not to commit himself to the views presented in the ST. This can also be seen in his attempt to attribute these views throughout the text to the ST writer as in يشير, يؤكد الكاتب الكاتب and وهذا رأي الكاتب as in sentences 2-4, respectively. He also made use of the strategy of addition in sentence (1) when he added الذي يثير السخط أحيانا to serve the same purpose. This neutral management of the ST, however, clashes with the subjective voice 'WE' which the translator highlights in the TT at the expense of the THEM voice. Moreover the translator neglects tackling this voice in a way that shows solidarity with TT readers and mitigates the harsh negative lexicalization directed towards those readers as عالم مفكك, غير ذوي العلم and الإرهابيين العتاة والمخبولين. It is to be noted, however, that while the translator succeeds in managing the bare assertion strategy in sentence 5 "we cannot afford….etc." by rendering it as a mere personal opinion وعليه, وهذا رأي, he neglects managing the bare assertion in sentences 1 and 2 إننا منفردون...الخ and ان رغبات القيادة لن تسمح لنا.

7 General Discussion and Conclusions

The writer's emotional response towards America's role in preaching democracy, its moral responsibility towards atrocities throughout the world, and the aesthetic attributes the writer associates America's deeds with are evident in the text. The analysis of the TTs following Martin's model shows the following:

1. the emotional tone of the ST writer is represented in sentences like 'we are alone' (sentence 1), 'the motives to hurt us at home' (sentence 2), 'to settle old scores with us' (sentence 4), and 'we cannot afford to react' (sentence 5). The test-subject translators follow different structures and strategies either to emphasize or deemphasize the ST writer's basic emotion-charged claims. Translator (1) attempts to bring about modifications of the ST writer's emotional attitudes and presents them, so he believes, to the TL readers appropriately, taking into account their expectations. Translator (2) seems to hold a converse attitude. He tries to reinforce the ST writer's emotions by adopting certain associative/ stylistic structures and strategies. Translators (3) and (4) take a neutral position. They work in a similar way, highlighting what is stated verbatim without imposing ideas of their own. Consequently, their renderings do not carry any negative/ positive emotional involvement. Hence, their renderings, unlike translators (1) and (2), are more objective and harmonious with the translation norms and ethics.
2. the moral behaviour evaluation of the state of affairs is expressed everywhere in the ST items of judgement value that have the potential to evoke negative or positive evaluations: 'in our radical interpretation', 'our rejection of elites', and 'our well-nigh demagogic respect' (sentence 1), 'we will more often make enemies than friends' (sentence 3), and 'Rather, we need to react prudently' (sentence 5). The collective

responsibility intended by the use of 'we' and 'our' throughout the text, for example, is shifted into an individual sense wherever they occur by translator (1). Conversely, translator (2) reinforces the collective sense of the ST through adding well-framed expressions with extra factual evidence such as نحن في الوقت الذي نضطلع (sentence 1), لا نظير لنا, خير من يفسر فيه بادوار مشرفة (sentence 3), and لن ننزوي جانبا في مواجهة المد البربري (sentence 5) which show his explicit positive judgements towards WE and negative position (and even his resentment) of THEM in the text. Moreover, the writer does not always present factual evidence to support his claims. This is evident in his use of the modal auxiliary 'may' and the frequency adverb 'more often' (sentence 3). However, translator (1) intentionally neglects such usage in his rendering just to support his factual evidence in favour of THEM. Translator 2, on the other hand provides factual evidence for the writer's claim through the use of certainty-charged lexical items such as لا محالة and هيهات هيهات (sentence 3).

3. the assessment and evaluation of the whole attitudinal meaning can be seen in the writer's selectivity of terms of high expressive quality and impact on his readers as in sentence (2) 'will not permit us to abdicate our responsibility for...'. Moreover, the assessment takes into account the significance and uniqueness of America in this troubled world and the writer's negative reaction towards the atrocities of others. This is in harmony with the terms and expressions neatly selected to suit this purpose. Both translators (1) and (2) foreground their subjective presence in communicating the ST message through their emotional response (as readers) to the ST, the former negatively and the latter positively. Moreover, the translators' involvement (positively and negatively) rather than observation of the textual world is attributed to their personal experience and

probably commitment to certain beliefs and ideologies. Translators (3) and (4) preserve the informativity, intentionality and underlying ideology of the ST writer in their assessment and evaluation conveying his sympathetic and affective attitudes, acquitting US of any responsibility and accusing THEM of indifference towards serious cases like terrorism. Finally, the translators' assessment of WE/ THEM- related attitudes can be inferable from the use of certain stylistic features and emphasizing certain linguistic items.

Building on what has been mentioned so far, one might ask: to what extent could strategies such as omissions, additions, hyperbole and negative lexicalization, for example, be considered errors in the translation product? To what extent is the translator's deliberate involvement (basically ideologically motivated) in a translation task in accord with translation norms and ethics? On what theoretical grounds one might deem such translation products mistranslations. Finally, what background knowledge and context variables are required to determine the nature of attitudes in an argumentative political text?

Appendices

Appendix 1

1.a Translator 1 Rendering

يرى مارك ان أمريكا تنفرد عن جميع شعوب العالم في ترجمة الديمقراطية حرفيا إلى واقع عملي ورفض حكم النخبة وإبداء الاحترام والتعاطف الكامل مع آراء العامة (1). لذا فهي تجد لزاما عليها بدافع إحساسها بما يقع على عاتقها من"التزام أخلاقي" في زعامة العالم ان لا تسمح لنفسها بالتخلي عن مسؤوليتها المزعومة في حماية المدنيين الأبرياء والوقوف بوجه إرهاب الدول (2).غير ان التزام أمريكا بهذه المواقف يستعدي عليها من الشعوب أكثر مما يجلب لها من صداقات على حد زعمه (3).ان من بين هذه الشعوب من يمتلك الوسائل بل و المبررات لايذاء أمريكا في عقر دارها (4).ان مما تجازى به أمريكا على محاولتها قيادة "العالم الممزق" الذي "تتناوشه الأزمات" هو المزيد من" الإرهابيين" و"المهووسين بالعنف" العازمين على تصفية حساباتهم معها (5). ان أمريكا لا تستطيع الاستجابة لهذه الضغوطات بالانسحاب من الساحة العالمية لكن عليها ان تتصرف بحكمة حسبما يرى مارك (6).

1.b Translator 2 Rendering

نحن خير من يفسر مفهوم الديمقراطية بكل دقائقه وجزئياته, ولا نظير لنا في رفضنا للنخب وفي احتقارنا لأراء الحثالة (1). إن متطلبات القيادة, إن لم نقل الحس بالمسؤولية الأخلاقية لن تحيد بنا عن واجبنا في حماية المدنيين الأبرياء من هول قطع للأعناق ترعاه الدولة على نحو منهجي (2). وفي الوقت الذي نضطلع فيه بادوار مشرفة كهذه ، فإننا لا محالة نحيط أنفسنا بحلقة من العداوة والبغضاء بدلا من الأصدقاء, ولربما قد يملك البعض في جعبته من الوسائل والدوافع ما من شأنه ألحاق الأذى بنا ، ولكن هيهات هيهات (3). ومن بين البلايا التي قد تحل بنا في محاولة محمومة غير مبررة البتة من قبلنا لتولى دفه القيادة في عالم ممزق الأوصال نزاع للازمات إرهاب يحرق الحرث والنسل وشذاذ للآفاق عازمون على

تسوية حساباتهم معنا (4) . ومع ذلك لن ننزوي جانبا في مواجهة هذا المد البربري على العكس , سوف نكون الدواء الشافي لهذا الداء (5).

1.c Translator 3 Rendering

نحن نتميز عن غيرنا في منظورنا الجذري للديمقراطية و رفضنا للنخبوية واحترامنا[*] لغير المتعلمين (1). (...). إن مركزنا القيادي (إن لم يكن الإحساس بالمسؤولية الأخلاقية) لن يسمح لنا بالتخلي عن مسؤوليتنا في حماية المدنيين الأبرياء و الوقوف بوجه المذابح التي تقف وراءها سياسات بعض الدول (2). ولكننا بتبنينا لهكذا ادوار فإننا سنخلق أعداء أكثر من الأصدقاء, وقد يملك بعض هؤلاء الأعداء الإمكانية وحتى الدافع –حسب اعتقادهم– لإيقاع الأذى بنا في وطننا (3). ومن بين عواقب محاولاتنا لتامين القيادة الضرورة لعالم متفكك وهش في وجه الأزمات ستكون مواجهة إرهابيين لم يكونوا بالحسبان وأنواع من المختلين المصممين على تصفية حساباتهم معنا (4). إن الانسحاب من العالم كنتيجة لما ذكرنا أمر غير ممكن بل الأجدر بنا أن نتعامل مع التحديات بحكمة وحصافة (5).

1.d Translator 4 Rendering

يقول الكاتب مارك ادنكتون في مقال نشر بصحيفة النيويورك تايمز بتاريخ 2 آذار 1993 إننا منفردون في تفسيرنا المتطرف للديمقراطية ورفضنا للنخب واحترامنا الكبير ، الذي يثير السخط أحيانا ، لأراء غير ذوي العلم (1). ويؤكد الكاتب, إن رغبات القيادة, ما لم يحكمها الشعور بالمسؤولية الأخلاقية, سوف لن تسمح لنا بالتخلي عن مسؤوليتنا من اجل حماية المواطنين الأبرياء و الوقوف بوجه المذبحة التي تتم بعلم الدولة (2). لكننا كما يشير الكاتب, و نحن نقوم بمهامنا هذه سوف نخلق لنا أعداء على الأغلب أكثر من الأصدقاء, وبعض

([*]) حذفت الصفة هنا لأنني أحسست بان ترجمتها بأي شكل ستسبب (loss of meaning), عليه حذفها أفضل من ترجمتها بشكل يثير الإرباك.

هؤلاء الأعداء قد تكون لديهم الوسائل, لا بل كما يتصورون, و الدوافع أيضا لإيذائنا في وطننا (3). وما سنحصل عليه جزاء محاولتنا لتوفير القيادة المطلوبة في عالم مفكك تحيق به الأزمات, سوف يتمثل في الإرهابيين العتاة والمخبولين الذين يصممون على تصفية حساباتهم معنا (4). وعليه , وهذا رأي الكاتب, فان رد فعلنا لا ينبغي إن يكون هو الانسحاب من العالم, بل نحتاج إلى رد فعل أكثر حصافة وحذرا (5). (النيويورك تايمز, مقال ماري. دي. دبليو. ادنكتون في 2 آذار 1993.

Appendix 2

2.a Evaluator 1 account of Translator 1 Rendering

This text is marked by its argumentative (persuasive) nature since its writer apparently aims at steering the situation in a way or another only to convince the readers about his stance. The writer, as it may seem, is an unusual advocate of democracy in the United States and tries his best to make his readers believe in his own views. The translator, however, exceeds his authorities by managing the text in different ways, changing the text into a counter-argumentative one.

The translator assumes the duty of a critic when he, in many respects, analyses and assesses the source text according to his own views instead of translating it. Consequently, the intended force and effect of the ST in the TT is lost. The translator, therefore, has breached one of the most important objectives of the process of translation, viz. interlingual communication. Another serious defect in translator 1 rendering is related to the very essence of the communicative act of translation. Instead of being an eliminator of the linguistic and cultural boundaries, the translator himself becomes a barrier that does not allow the accurate ST message to be delivered to the TL readers. Some translators may resort to this out of fear from their readers negative reactions or to show their resentment towards the ST message.

The basic objective of any translator should be that of a messenger, while in this rendering he has manipulated its content so he is unfaithful messenger. Furthermore, the

translator has denied to the Arab readers having full and easy access to the original ideology. This sort of management is probably more useful in certain socio-cultural domains (e.g. tabooed areas in particular) than political discourse. Neutrality is the solution, indeed.

2.b Evaluator 2 account of Translator 1 Rendering

First, I admit that the translator's language and style is excellent; it gives him a lot of credit. He was successful in manipulating the text towards his own objectives. However, it is not unusual for a critic or evaluator to raise some questions as: is management legitimate in translation? If it is so, is it rule-governed? Should managing be for or against the ST producer's goal? Is management applicable to all text types? What type of text do we need to manage?

Undoubtedly management is the translator's choice; but his choice is usually constrained by the clients' demands before TL readers expectations. Therefore, the translator is not allowed to manage a text to be translated unless required to do that. Otherwise, the translation process would not be more than an absurd activity. Now if we take into account that the translator is dealing with an argumentative text, we expect that any managing of the ST will result in distortion of the ideas and objectives of the ST.

Having read the TL version of the text, one can notice that the text was mismanaged on purpose. The translator resorted to syntactic and lexical devices that inform his readers not to believe in what has been stated by the TL writer. Some of these are lexical items such as يرى, فهي تجد, المزعومة, على حد زعمه, على حد تعبيره and حسبما يرى مارك. The translation of every first person pronoun into a third person pronoun was the main syntactic means the translator resorted to: فهي, عليها, لنفسها, لها and معها. He also used the Arabic word ان used in Arabic to express certainty in his rendering of the English modal verb 'may' (sentence 3) which expresses probability. This could better be rendered into ربما to show the least amount of neutrality. Furthermore, in the same sentence "they think"

which is necessary for the meaning of the sentence has been rendered into ان من بين هذه الشعوب من يمتلك الوسائل بل و المبررات لايذاء أمريكا في عقر دارها. A better translation could be كما يتوهمون. So the proposed translation of this sentence would be وربما يمتلك البعض الوسائل لإيذائنا داخل بلادنا ولكن ليس لديهم المبررات كما يتوهمون.

By using the first pronoun in (لإيذائنا and بلادنا) and (داخل بلادنا) instead of (عقر دارها) which indicates that America is unable to defend itself, we convey what the original writers aims at.

I can say that the target text is well-painted from outside but badly affected from inside. It seems that the translator gives his own opinion about the SL text more than he makes a translation of it. He does not convey the real attitude of the original writer, rather he shows his own attitude concerning the text. It is clear that the translator has been driven by his beliefs. So, one can say that he was not faithful but biased. I call what the translator did a commentary on the original text because his own attitude and not the writer's that is extremely highlighted throughout the translation product.

2.c <u>Translator 5 Standard Rendering</u>

لا أحد يضارعنا في رؤيتنا الجوهرية للديمقراطية, ونبذنا لحكم الصفوة, والى حد ما مراعاتنا الغوغائية لوجهات نظر الجهلاء ومعتقداتهم (1). وما لم تكن مقتضيات القيادة شعورا بالمسؤولية الأخلاقية ، فلن تسمح لنا بالتخلي عن مهمتنا في حماية المدنيين الأبرياء والوقوف بحزم ضد المجازر التي ترعاها الدولة (2). بيد إننا حين نضطلع بمهمات من هذا النوع ، فإننا غالبا ما نخلق أعداء أكثر بدلا من كسب الأصدقاء (3). كما قد يمتلك البعض ، حسب اعتقادهم ، الوسائل والدوافع لإيذائنا في عقر دارنا (4). وسيكون ضمن المكافئات التي نتلقاها جزاء سعينا في تهيئة القيادة المطلوبة في عالم متفتت ونزّاع إلى الأزمات مالا يمك ن تخيله من الإرهابيين وشتى أنواع المضطربين عقليا (السايكوباثيين) ممن عقدوا العزم على تصفية حساباتهم معنا (5). وليس بمقدورنا ، والحال كهذه ، تحمل إن يكون رد فعلنا هو الانسحاب والتخلي عن هذا العالم ، بل حري بنا إن نتصرف

بحكمة وحذر (6). (صحيفة نيويورك تايمز /مارك. دي . دبل يو / ادنغتون / 1993/3/2)

اثر الجوانب العاطفية والمعرفية لمواقف المترجم في ترجمة النص

ا.م.د. أنيس بهنام نعوم م.م. يحيى خالد عبد(*)

المستخلص

يتناول البحث دراسة التعبيرات اللغوية التي يمكن أن تحث القراء/ المترجمين إلى التفاعل سلبا أو إيجابا مع النص. فهو يؤكد على دور المعنى الموقفي الذاتي للمترجم في تعزيز الوظيفة الجدلية في سياق الخطاب السياسي الصحفي. ويتناول البحث أيضا المعاني الموقفية والقصدية التي تتجلى في النص من خلال البنى اللغوية وانتقاء المفردات والسياق. ويفترض البحث بناء على ما توصل إليه الباحثان في قراءتهما لما كتب في ميدان المواقف (فولكرد 2006 وباوندز 2005 ووايت 2005 وايجنز وسليد 1997 وآخرون غيرهم) تبني المترجمين –شانهم في ذلك شان كاتب النص الأصل– مواقف سلبية كانت أم ايجابية تجاه النص قيد الترجمة, إذ يتجلى ذلك من خلال استخدام المترجمين لغة تفصح ولو ضمنيا عن مشاعرهم وتقييمهم للشخوص والظروف التي يدور حولها النص. كما تفترض الدراسة اعتماد كشف المواقف على تفعيل القارئ (المترجم) مجموعة من الأفكار والإيديولوجيات والتوقعات أثناء عملية الترجمة. وهكذا, قد يكون لذات النص تفسيرات مختلفة باختلاف إيديولوجيات المترجمين. ولإثبات هذه الفرضية عمد الباحثان إلى انتقاء نص سياسي قام بترجمته خمسة من طلبة الماجستير في قسم الترجمة في كلية الآداب/ جامعة الموصل للعام الدراسي 2006–2007. وقد تم تحليل هذه الترجمات وفقا لأنموذج مارتن التقييمي (2000) الذي يقسم مكونات المعنى الموقفي إلى عاطفي وحكمي وتقييمي. و قد خلصت الدراسة إلى تبني المترجمين –شعوريا أو لا شعوريا– مواقف ذاتية نابعة من الإيديولوجيات و المعتقدات التي يحملونها تجاه الأحداث والشخوص التي يدور حولها النص قيد الترجمة.

(*) قسم اللغة الإنكليزية/ كلية الآداب/ جامعة الموصل.